

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROBERT PLASTER, #846864,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 1:23-cv-591
-v-)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
HEIDI WASHINGTON, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Plaster filed a motion for a preliminary injunction (ECF No. 96). Plaintiff seeks accommodations for strip searches of cross-gendered prisoners. The Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending the Court deny the motion (ECF No. 112). Plaintiff filed objections (ECF No. 121). The Court will adopt the report and recommendation.

After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam).

The Magistrate Judge identified three reasons to deny the request for a preliminary injunction. First, Plaintiff did not show that the balance of relevant factors weighed in favor of the relief sought. Second, the requested injunction was not connected to the only

remaining claim. And third, because Plaintiff had been transferred since filing the request for an accommodation, the motion for injunctive relief became moot.

Plaintiff's objections do not address the reasoning in the report and recommendation. Starting with mootness, Plaintiff has not established that the facility where Plaintiff currently resided denied a request for an accommodation. Plaintiff sought and was denied an accommodation from the prior facility. Plaintiff's objections do not address the second reason provided by the Magistrate Judge. Plaintiff has not established a connection between the injunctive relief sought and the only claim remaining in this lawsuit, a claim for equal protection related to a prison job. In addition, Plaintiff brings the job claim against two specific individuals but seeks an injunction that would have to be enforced against a host of individuals not named as defendants in this lawsuit.

For these reasons, the Court **ADOPTS** the report and recommendation (ECF No. 112) and **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (ECF No. 96).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: July 29, 2024

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge